



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,846	12/12/2003	Manjeri Ramanathan Dharmarajan	JP920030198US1	1981
39903	7590	07/17/2007	EXAMINER	
ANTHONY ENGLAND PO Box 5307 AUSTIN, TX 78763-5307			ALMEIDA, DEVIN E	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2132				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/17/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/734,846	DHARMARAJAN, MANJERI RAMANATHAN
	Examiner Devin Almeida	Art Unit 2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 and 18-35 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 18-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the papers filed 7/22/2007. Claims 1-3 and 18-35 were amended. Claims 11-17 were canceled.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to 35 USC 101 are persuasive the rejection has been dropped.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the password generator is not time sensitive are not persuasive. The claims state "the password is based at least on a first application name and a single key" this means that other factors said as time can go into the generating of the password.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the password generator is time dependent but not in the particular fashion taught by Guski are not persuasive. Guski teaches the password is valid for a predetermined time interval.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 are not persuasive. Guski teaches "receiving said first application name again by the password generator at a second time and generating a second instance of the first password for said first application by the password generator, wherein the generating of the second instance of the first password is based on at least said first application name received at the second time and based on said single key, and the generated first password is identical in its first and second instance if no time interval has been user specified for the first and second instances or if a time interval has been user specified but not elapsed between the first and second times." The

Applicant is reminded that there is two ways to reject to that part of claim 1. The first way is the generated first password is identical in its first and second instance if no time interval has been user specified for the first and second instances. The second way is the generated first password is identical in its first and second instance if a time interval has been user specified but not elapsed between the first and second times. Applicant is also reminded that the password can be generated from more then just the first application name and based on said single key since the claim states "at least said first application name received at the second time and based on said single key". Guski teaches the password is valid for a predetermined time interval (see column 6 lines 61 – column 7 line 3 teaches that the password is valid for a predetermined time interval and after that interval a new password has to be generated to get access.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 2 are not persuasive. Guski teaches different inputs to the password generator generate different passwords see column 8 line 26 – column 10 line 3.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 2 are not persuasive. Guski teaches the password is valid for a predetermined time interval.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-3, 18-20, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1, 18,

and 27 recites the limitation "time interval". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 1-3, 18-20, and 27-29 are also indefinite as it is unclear if the claim is limited by a "time interval" or is it not limited by a "time interval". The applicant is claiming that the password can be generated from at least a first application name and a single key. That may include a time interval or may not include a time interval. It is unclear as to whether the applicant intends to limit the claim including a time interval or not include the time interval.

Claims 1-3, 18-20, and 27-29 are also indefinite because according to the remarks on page 12 in trying to claim two different embodiments of the present invention in one claim which make the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to whether the password is time depend or not.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1-5, 10, 18-22, 26-31 and 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Guski et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,592,553). Guski teaches everything with respect to claims 1, 18 and 27, a method of generating a password for at least one application using a single key, said method comprising

the steps of: receiving said single key (see figure 3 element 306) by a password generator (see figure 3 element 300 and column 6 lines 20-41); receiving a first application name by a password generator at a first time, wherein the first application name is associated with a first application (see figure 3 element 304 and column 6 lines 20-41); generating a first instance of a first password for said first application by the password generator, wherein the generator of the first password is, based on at least said said first application name received at the first time and based on said single key (see figure 3 element 310 and column 6 lines 20-41); receiving said first application name again by the password generator at a second time (see column 6 lines 20-41, column 6 lines 61 – column 7 line 3 and column 8 line 26 – column 9 line 21); and generating a second instance of the first password for said first application by the password generator, whereing the generating of the second instance of the first password is based on at least said first application name received at the second time and based on said single key, and the generated first password is identical in its first and second instance if no time interval has been user specified for the first and second instances or if a time interval has been user specified but not elapsed between the first and second times (see column 6 lines 61 – column 7 line 3 teaches that the password is valid for a predetermined time interval and after that interval a new password has to be generated to get access).

With respect to claims 2, 19 and 28, receiving a second application name by a password generator at a third time, wherein the second application name is different than the first application name and is associated with a second

application; generating a first instance of a second password for said second application by the password generator, wherein the generating of the first instance of the second password is based on said second application name received at the third time and based on said single key, wherein the second password is different than the first password; (see column 6 lines 20-41 and column 8 line 26 – column 9 line 21 i.e. it's inherent to generate multiple passwords because the generator takes the application ID and different application ID gives you different password); receiving said second application name again at a forth time by the password generator (see column 6 lines 20-41, column 6 lines 61 – column 7 line 3 and column 8 line 26 – column 9 line 21); and generating a second instance of the second password for said first application by the password generator, wherein the generating of the second instance of the second password is based on at least said second application name received at the fourth time and based on said single key, and the generated second password is identical in its first and second instance if no time interval has been user specified for the first and second instances or if a time interval has been user specified but not elapsed between the third and fourth times (see column 6 lines 61 – column 7 line 3 teaches that the password is valid for a predetermined time interval and after that interval a new password has to be generated to get access).

With respect to claims 3, 20 and 29, receiving a user specified time interval by the password generator indicating an interval during which the password generator is to produce identical instances of the first password for

identical instances of the received first application name and single key; and (see figure 3 element 304 and column 6 lines 20-41); generating a third instance of a first password responsive to receiving said application name at a time after expiration of the interval wherein in the third instance the generated first password is different than the first and second instance of the password, even though the application name received for generating the third instance of the first password is identical to the application name received at the first and second times (see column 6 lines 61 – column 7 line 3 teaches that the password is valid for a predetermined time interval and after that interval a new password has to be generated to get access).

With respect to claims 4, 21 and 30, receiving first password constraints for said first password, wherein generating said first password is further based on said first password constraints (see column 8 line 26 – column 9 line 21).

With respect to claims 5, 22, and 31, wherein generating said first password utilises at least one encryption technique selected from the group of encryption techniques consisting of Block Addition, International Data Encryption Algorithm (IDEA), BLOWFISH, Software-optimized Encryption Algorithm (SEAL), RC4, Data Encryption Standard (DES), and RSA (see column 8 lines 53-67).

With respect to claim 10, wherein said first application is selected from the group of applications consisting of bank account, Internet email account, Internet website, and computer account (see column 1 lines 16-29).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6-9, 23-26, and 32-35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guski et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,592,553) in view of well-known practices in the art. Guski teaches everything with respect to claim 1, 18 and 27 above but does not teach with respect to claims 6, 23 and 32, generating a first userid for said first application, based on at least said single key and said first application name. It is well known in the art that generating a first userid for said first application, based on at least said single key and said first application name and Official Notice is taken. Guski already teaches generating a password based on single key and said first application name (see figure 3 element 310 and column 6 lines 20-41). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have generated a unique ID for an application based on a key and an application name to make it harder for a third party to intercept and guess the user ID. Therefore one would have been motivated to have included generating a user ID.

With respect to claims 7, 24 and 33, receiving a first userid time period, wherein generating said first userid is further based on said time period (see figure 3 element 308 and column 6 lines 20-41).

With respect to claims 8, 25 and 34, receiving first userid constraints for said first userid, wherein generating said first password is further based on said first userid constraints (see column 7 line 58 – column 8 line 6 and column 8 line 26 – column 9).

With respect to claims 9, 26, and 35, wherein generating said first password utilises at least one encryption technique selected from the group of encryption techniques consisting of Block Addition, International Data Encryption Algorithm (IDEA), BLOWFISH, Software-optimized Encryption Algorithm (SEAL), RC4, Data Encryption Standard (DES), and RSA (see column 6 lines 20-34).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Art Unit: 2132

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devin Almeida whose telephone number is 571-270-1018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays from 7:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron, can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DA
Devin Almeida
Patent Examiner
2/7/2007

Gilberto Barron Jr.
GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100